1763

THE

OPPOSITION

TO THE

Late MINISTER Vindicated.

[Price One Shilling.]

RPJCB

THE

OPPOSITION

To the Late

MINISTER

VINDICATED

From the Aſperſions of a PAMPHLET,
intitled,

CONSIDERATIONS

ON THE PRESENT

DANGEROUS CRISIS.

LONDON:

Printed for W. BATHOE near *Exeter-Change*
in the *Strand*.

MDCCLXIII.

KPJC

THE

OPPOSITION

TO THE

Late MINISTER Vindicated.

WHY the preſent Miniſtry, who have not yet been oppoſed, ſhould declare War againſt the Oppoſition to the late Miniſter, is a Queſtion not eaſily anſwered, without ſuppoſing the preſent to be a Continuation of the late Miniſtry. Some Endeavours are uſed, in the Pamphlet before us, to diſguiſe ſo invidious an Appearance. There is an Affectation of Can-

dour and Impartiallity, in allowing all the material Things that have ever been objected to the noble Lord. One would imagine the Writer had his Lordſhip's Conſent to do it; for he makes him ample Reparation, by aſcribing them to great and amiable Cauſes. His very Oratory, which, of all Parts of his Character, a prudent Apologiſt ſhould have left untouched, is called ſpeaking *fortiter in re*. The Pride and Arrogance imputed to him, are ſaid to flow from the Delicacy of a feeling Mind; and a long Liſt of good Qualities, of which a Writer on the other Side would deny his Lordſhip the Property, is balanced againſt the *confeſſed* Want of *good Humour*, *Patience*, *Moderation*, *Affability*, *Complacency*, and *Forbearance*.

But with all this Affectation of Candour, this ingenious Writer ſlips into Partiality, in the Character he gives of Mr. PITT. As he endeavours to make Lord *Bute*'s Character *amiable*, notwithſtanding the Vices and Follies he admits in it, ſo he labours to make

Mr.

Mr. *Pitt*'s *odious*, notwithſtanding the Virtues he allows him, and the immenſe Services which the State has received from his Adminiſtration.

It is in vain to enter into a Controverſy about Characters, with which the Public is perfectly well acquainted. The Author of the *Conſiderations* cannot give the People a better Opinion of Lord *Bute*, than has been formed from his Adminiſtration; and no Advocate of Mr. *Pitt*'s can eſtabliſh a better Opinion of him, than he himſelf has long ſince eſtabliſhed throughout the Kingdom. If this were the whole of the Pamphlet, ſo illiberal a way of recommending and accuſing Men to the People would hardly merit Attention. But the Writer having ventured to defend the Meaſures of the late Miniſter, with a View to diſcredit the Oppoſition to him, the Diligence with which this Piece has been circulated, extorts an Anſwer.

The oppoſing Party are called *malicious* and *unjuſt*, for impeaching the Treaty of Peace, and the new Exciſe upon Cyder.

They are ſaid to have condemned the Peace, before they were acquainted with a ſingle Article of the Treaty. If the Writer means, before a ſingle Article was delivered out by Authority, it may be true; but if the Articles, which they condemned, proved afterwards to be the genuine ones, the *Malice* and *Injuſtice* of their Cenſure ſhould be proved, not from the Date of it, but from the Wiſdom and Rectitude of thoſe Articles.

The Treaty is concluded, and the Nation, it is to be hoped, will acquieſce in it, with all due Reſpect to Government. Why then is the Subject revived by Men, who would better conſult their Intereſt and their Peace of Mind, in having it forgot? Is there not room to ſuſpect, that they themſelves diſcern the Force of the Objections made to the

Peace;

Peace; and from thence very rightly conclude, that the Oppoſition to it was meritorious, and has left an Impreſſion upon the People?

The firſt Rumours of a Negotiation, it is confeſſed, were received with ſome Prejudice, from an Opinion, not ill founded, that the Miniſter had an *Intereſt* in bringing about a Peace. His Friends were too happy in the Proſpect of it, to keep the Secret even with political Decency; for every material Article, and many Circumſtances of the Negotiation were publickly known, ſome Time before they were authenticated. This being unuſual, they muſt have tranſpired inadvertently; and it is not unfair to ſuppoſe, that ſuch Inadvertency was the Reſult of an overflowing Joy. The Situation of the late Miniſter was evidently hazarded by the uncertain Events of War; and, if it had been poſſible to eſtabliſh him, a Peace would have done it.

There was likewiſe abundant Joy in *France*. The *Britiſh* Miniſter and the *French* Nation appeared on this Occaſion to be ſo united in Heart and Mind, that it was difficult to determine, from which Side of the Water the Offer of Peace was firſt made.

The *Engliſh* Nation was, of Courſe, inflamed at this Appearance of Things. They could not but apprehend, that the *French* Miniſtry would diſcern the Motives which muſt neceſſarily in ſome degree influence the Conduct of the *Britiſh* Miniſter. Was there any Reaſon to think Lord *B.* more honeſt than other Men, circumſtanced in all Reſpects like him, would have been? Had he not the difficult Task upon his Hands, of ſupporting himſelf againſt a *Free* People, by the *mere Favour* of the King? And being ſo circumſtanced, what could he do better for *himſelf*, than make a Peace upon *any* Terms.

It is granted, that the Terms were as good as could be expected from him; and the

early

early Prejudice againſt the Peace was founded in a juſt Opinion, that he could not obtain ſo good Terms as the Nation was intitled to, nor ſuch, as might at that Time have been obtained by the Miniſter who conducted the War. Our Author affirms, that the Terms were better than had been offered to that Miniſter. This might be doubted, for it has been denied in a great Aſſembly. But, admitting it, how much better was our Condition, than at the Time of thoſe Offers? We had more Conqueſts in Hand; Affairs were mended in *Germany*; and the Enemy was nearer Ruin at home, than we. Our Debts and Difficulties are loudly talked of, in Juſtification of the Peace. They have been magnified in a manner, which argues but little of that national Pride which animated our Counſels and Arms during the War. But admitting what might be very true, that we were *almoſt* exhauſted, the Enemy outdid us in nothing but this, for they were apparently *quite* exhauſted.

There was hardly a Perſon in the Oppoſition, who did not wiſh for a Peace laſt Year. Some of the Perſons in Oppoſition knew the Condition of *France* as well as Lord *B.* could be ſuppoſed to know it; and, ſo far as appears from all they ſaid and did on the Occaſion, they were of Opinion, that a Peace at that Time was deſirable; but that a *better* Peace, more honourable and more advantageous, might have been obtained. Have not the Peace-makers themſelves given ſome Ground for the Opinion, by obtaining better Terms in the Definitive Treaty, than had been agreed to in the Preliminaries? They deſerve no Reproach for this; but neither do they deſerve any Thanks. The Oppoſition to the Peace neceſſitated them to produce to the World an Evidence, that the *French* Miniſtry were more tractable than we had Reaſon to be, and that ſo material a Truth was diſcovered too late.

The Arguments againſt the Terms of Peace lie in a very ſhort Compaſs. The

primary,

primary Object of the War had been in our Hands three Years before the Peace was concluded. The Enemy had obſtinately protracted an unſucceſsful War, at an amazing Expence to us. Might we not equitably hope to avail ourſelves of ſome of the Succeſſes we have had ſince the Acquiſition of *Canada*, and to reimburſe ourſelves in part, by retaining one of the valuable Iſlands, inſtead of reimburſing the Enemy, by ſurrendering both, better conditioned than we found them, and after the Subjects of *France* had enriched themſelves, by ſharing in the Benefits and Privileges belonging to the *Britiſh* Planters? Was it the Object of our Counſels, and an Employment fit for our Arms, to conquer thoſe Iſlands, in order to take the Subjects of *France* into our Protection, and ſecure their Trade againſt the *Britiſh* Men of War and Privateers?

It was a Queſtion two or three Years before, whether *Canada* or *Guadalupe* ſhould be retained by us, and the Queſtion was thought

thought an embarraſſing one. Was not that Queſtion changed by the State of the War, as it ſtood laſt Summer? Were all the ſubſequent Conqueſts nothing? and was it *malicious* and *unjuſt* in the wiſeſt Men of this Nation, towards their Sovereign or their Country, to expect, that ſomething like an Indemnity ſhould ariſe from the Conqueſts made with ſo much Blood and Treaſure?

The Account between us and our Enemies was very ſhort and intelligible. France took Minorca; Spain took nothing. I am not diſpoſed to inflame my Countrymen, by reciting all that we have taken. Our national Glory begins to be an obnoxious Subject at home. The Friends of the Miniſtry forbear calling the laſt A GLORIOUS War, which is its true Deſcription; they chuſe rather, in Juſtification of the Peace, to call it a *bloody* and *expenſive* War, which is no more deſcriptive of this, than of any the moſt ignominious War.

The Treaty of *Utrecht* has been complained of for many Years, and very juſtly. But what was the State of the Account between us and the *French* at the Time of that Treaty, if compared with our late Superiority over that broken, diſgraced, diſpirited nation? They could not have carried on the War longer without extreme Difficulty; and if they ſhould renew it ſooner than their Friend our late Miniſter may expect, will it not be with the Ammunition which they have had the Dexterity to draw from this Treaty of Peace?

It is a poor Defence of the Meaſure, to charge the Oppoſition to it with undue and indirect Motives, amidſt ſo many *direct* and *honourable* Motives to influence the Oppoſers. Before the Matter was conſidered in Parliament, the general Diſlike of it was imputed to the private perſonal Intereſt which ſome commercial Men had in the War, and which would induce them to exclaim againſt *any* Peace. There might be ſuch Men and ſuch

Motives

Motives. But were there not many alſo, who had a private perſonal Intereſt in the Support of the Miniſter, and conſequently in *any* Peace? And, after deducting those seen under each of theſe Deſcriptions, was there not a large Number of diſintereſted Men remaining, who judged upon the plain State of the Caſe between us and the Enemy, that the national Honour and Intereſt were not ſufficiently conſulted in the Terms of Peace?

When the Oppoſition was made in Parliament, there being no Pretence for imputing it to Motives of immediate Intereſt, other Motives equally diſhonourable were aſſigned, leſt the Nation ſhould form the obvious Judgment, that Men of the firſt Rank, of the greateſt Underſtanding, of independent Wealth, and of known Attachment to the Family on the Throne, as well as to the Intereſt of their Country, oppoſed the Peace upon right Motives.

They

They were called a FACTION, and the Word has been trumpeted about the Kingdom. But mere Words are a feeble Support to a public Cauſe; and Invectives are, in this Caſe, the moſt impotent of all Words, If an Aſſociation of *wiſe* and *diſintereſted* Men, for the Purpoſe of delivering the King and Conſtitution from the dangerous Ambition of a Fellow-Subject, be a Faction, then the Oppoſers of the late Miniſter deſerve that Name, and will be proud of it. But if a Party, compoſed of Men of different Views and Principles, united by manifeſt Motives of Intereſt, and conſpiring to aggrandize one Man, againſt the known Intereſt of the King, at the Hazard of the Conſtitution, and at the Expence of public Tranquility, be a FACTION, the Name will return naturally to its original Proprietors, notwithſtanding the Virulence with which they caſt it from themſelves upon other Men.

The next Article of Impeachment againſt the Oppoſition is, their having oppoſed an

Extenſion of the Exciſe Laws. The Writer introduces it with confeſſing the Tax upon Cyder to have been *precipitate*, *impolitic*, and *inadequate*; pretty heavy Charges againſt a Tax, which it has been uſual to contrive with *Deliberation*, *Wiſdom*, and a *nice Eſtimate* of the Sufficiency of it for the Payments to which it is appropriated.

He confeſſes moreover, by referring us to the Act of *William* the Third, that this Tax is an EXTENSION of the Exciſe Laws; for that Act taxes only the Maker of Cyder from *bought* Fruit; this taxes the Maker *in general*. He would have it underſtood, that there is but little Difference in this. The Inſinuation is very unbecoming a Writer, who Complains of Want of Candour and Integrity in the Writers on the other Side. The Difference is, that the Makers from bought Fruit are very few in Compariſon; and the Makers *in general* are, the Peers, Gentlemen, Freeholders, and Farmers of Six or Seven Counties.

There

There is beſides a material Difference between the Maker of Cyder from bought Fruit, and the Farmer who grows it. The Maker from bought Fruit can chuſe, whether he will buy Fruit, and be a Cyder-maker. He knows upon what Terms and Conditions he ſubjects himſelf to Exciſe Laws. Whereas the Farmer, who grows it, is of courſe, and, without any Choice of his own, become ſubject to Exciſe Laws, or he muſt forego the Produce of his Farm.

It was with this Attention to Liberty and Equity, that the Duty upon Beer and Ale was made payable only by him, who ſells it. Every Man may brew as little as he pleaſes. Whereas the Apple-grower muſt make more Cyder, than for his own Conſumption. The periſhable nature of his Fruit leaves him no Choice. It has been ſuggeſted, that this Tax may create Cyder-makers, who, by buying the Apples, may exempt the Farmer from the Viſitation of Exciſemen. A bleſſed Effect indeed! The

Farmer of a Cyder Farm is to have the Alternative, of either ſubjecting himſelf to an Oppreſſion, to which no other Farmers are ſubject, or of diſpoſing of his *periſhable* Fruit to a monopolizing Cyder-maker, who will be enabled by the Terrors of this Tax, and of the Mode of levying it, to bring the Farmer to his own terms.

The Exciſe upon, and Compoſition for, Malt is no Grievance, compared with this Exciſe upon Cyder. It is the Maltſter's own free Choice to ſubject himſelf to it. He is under no neceſſity to turn Maltſter for the ſake of his Barley; for the Barley will not periſh immediately; and if the demand for it at home ſhould not anſwer his Expectation, he has a Chance of finding a demand for it abroad, and is encouraged to export it, by a Bounty. Barley therefore is a marketable Commodity; Apples are not till made into Cyder. They are not fit for Exportation, nor will they admit of delay in the Sale. The Maltſter has another chance.

He

He may convert his Barley into Spirits, and has in that caſe too the advantage of a Premium for Exportation. Cyder may be converted into Spirits; but there is no Premium for the Exportation of that ſpecies of Spirits. So that every Argument, which has been drawn, from the caſe of Beer and of Malt, is foreign to the Objections, which have been made to this Exciſe upon Cyder.

Our Author indeed acquaints us, that this is no new method of Taxation; for the Duty on Mead and other Liquors is, by ſeveral Acts, made payable by the *Maker generally*. There would be ſome weight in this Plea, if he could name the Farm, which produces nothing but Honey, or if he could prove, that the Inconveniences ariſing from the Duty upon Mead, and thoſe other Liquors, are in any degree ſo extenſive, as thoſe ariſing from this new Exciſe upon Cyder.

The Hiſtory, which he gives us of the Taxes on Cyder, is a very indifferent Apology

for this new Tax. The Act of *Charles* the Second, he tells us, having laid a Duty upon the *Retailer*, the Act of *William* the Third, intrenched farther on the Liberty of the Subject, by laying the Duty upon the Maker of Cyder from *bought* Fruit for ſale. *Where* then, ſays he, is the new Encroachment on Liberty? *Where* is the additional Badge of Servitude? It is ſtrange, that he ſhould repeatedly ſay, *Tell me where*, for he ſees it in his next Sentence. The Duty is now payable by the Maker *generally*, that is, by the Peers, Gentlemen, Freeholders and Farmers of Six or Seven Counties, who *never were before, and are now, ſubjected to* EXCISE Laws. Great as the Authority of our glorious Deliverer is, it is here very invidiouſly quoted. The Friends to his Memory are ſo, becauſe they are Friends to Liberty, and are not ſo implicitly devoted even to Him, as to concur in ſuperadding a new Encroachment on Liberty, to a new Encroachment of the ſame kind in his Reign.

The

The Author ſeems to triumph, when he mentions the Compoſition of Five Shillings per head, to exempt thoſe, who make Cyder for private Conſumption, from the Viſitation of Exciſe Officers. But is it the caſe of any Man, who rents a Cyder Farm, that he makes no more Cyder, than for private Conſumption? We may judge from the Quantities conſumed all over *England*, and the Quantities exported, how ſmall the private Conſumption of the Farmer is, in proportion to the Quantity of Apples he grows. But to ſhew the Futility of this Argument more glaringly, let us ſuppoſe the Growers of Wheat to be made liable to an Exciſe for their Wheat; would it be a Remedy adequate to the Evil, or any Conſolation to the Farmers, to allow them a Compoſition for the Quantity of Wheat conſumed in their own Families?

After reaſoning ſo very anſwerably, in ſupport of the Exciſe upon Cyder, our Author concludes, as might be expected, with

an Aſſertion of his own, that there is no reaſonable ground for the violent Clamour made againſt the Mode of Collection, *unleſs Cyder Makers have a Right to more Liberty, than the Makers of other Liquors.* I anſwer, with an Appeal to Truth and Common ſenſe, that Apple-growers have a Right to enjoy as much Liberty, as Barley-growers, and that they are neceſſarily Cyder-makers, becauſe they are Apple-growers; whereas the Barley-grower is not neceſſarily a Maltſter, or a Brewer.

But this is only a ſmall Fallacy of our Author's; he commits a greater, when he affirms, that the Bill paſſed, without any application from the Counties aggrieved, or ſuppoſed to be agrieved. It is well known with how much Precipitation the Bill paſſed; with ſo much, that this very Advocate for it acknowleges it to have been *precipitate*. The Counties aggrieved had not time to inſtruct their Members in form, or to petition Parliament. But if Letters from the Gentlemen

and

and Farmers in thoſe Counties, to Members of both Houſes, are any Evidence, Volumes of them might be produced to prove, how general the Diſcontent was, before the paſſing of the Act; and the Thanks and Inſtructions, which ſome Gentlemen have received ſince, abundantly ſhew, how early the Oppoſition without Doors began, and how vigorouſly it ſtill ſubſiſts.

It may be candid to ſuppoſe theſe Fallacies undeſigned, or perhaps Fallacies may be conſidered as the Privilege of an infirm Cauſe. But what ſhall we ſay to a Writer of Decency and of apparent Authority, who ventures to aſſert an abſolute Falſhood, which this Gentleman does, in ſaying, that the Bill paſſed through the Houſe of Commons without a Diviſion. I would not in direct terms charge him with a Falſhood, if I could not appeal to every Member of that Honourable Houſe, whether there were not at leaſt Six Diviſions upon it?

The

The Reader ſees upon the whole, that this Tax is a manifeſt *Extenſion* of the Exciſe Laws, to Perſons, who were not ſubject to them before, and are by this Law put upon a worſe footing, than their Fellow Subjects in other parts of the Kingdom, to whom the Exciſe Laws do not yet extend. It was therefore liable to all the Oppoſition and Clamour it has met with, even if we could ſuppoſe the Adminiſtration, who projected it, to have been Wiſe and favourable to Liberty.

It is a feeble Attempt to miſlead the Reader, when, inſtead of a ſolid manly Defence of the Tax, we are amuſed with trite Declamations about the Malice of Party, and with inflammatory Invectives againſt other Taxes, which are paid without murmuring, and conſtitute a conſiderable part of the Public Revenue.

The Tax upon Beer, which theſe impotent Candidates for Popularity tell us, in a florid way,

way, is *cruelly wrung from the briny Sweat of Induſtry*, was, at the Time, the beſt Tax, that could be contrived. If I remember rightly, the Brewers intended to impoſe it, if the Parliament had not. It operates ſo inſenſibly, that the People, who murmured at it, begin to be reconciled to it; and it produces ſo conſiderable a Revenue, that it is a great Act of Infidelity towards Government, to throw out, in a ſeemingly authoriſed Pamphlet, Inſinuations againſt a Burden, which it was neceſſary to impoſe, and which the late Miniſter had not Skill to remove.

He had thoughts of purchaſing Popularity by the Sacrifice of this Piece of National Strength; and, finding it impoſſible, ſtumbled, in his Reveries, upon a Tax leſs profitable and more obnoxious. He made one bold Effort for Popularity, in paſſing this very Bill, by profeſſing an *Abhorrence* of Exciſe. His Apologiſt in the Pamphlet before us imitates him. I am not aſhamed to repeat my Words, that it is unfaithful, and

unkind

unkind to Government, in a Servant of the Crown, to declaim againſt the Method of collecting the moſt valuable Branch of the Revenue, unleſs he had a more unexceptionable Method to propoſe; and it was much too thin a Veil to throw over this Cyder Bill, which extends the oppreſſive part of that method of Collection to almoſt every Gentleman and Farmer in ſo conſiderable a part of *England*.

I ſay of ENGLAND, for *Scotland* is not at all affected by it. Moſt of the Counties in *South-Britain* make ſome Cyder, though it is the peculiar produce of only Six or Seven; but SCOTLAND makes none. It would have been too glaring an Act of partiality, to have laid a general Tax upon *Great Britain*, and by an expreſs Proviſo to have exempted *Scotland* from paying it. A wiſer and more decent Expedient was hit upon; a heavy Burden is laid on *South Britain*, which ſhall not reach to *Scotland*; that happy Land of *Goſhen* ſhall not touch the

Burden

Burden with one Finger, and ſhall be exempted from all the Plagues and Vexations, which fall upon her united Siſter, both as to the Load of the Tax itſelf, and as to the oppreſſive Mode of Collection, which aggravates the Burthen infinitely beyond the natural Weight of it.

Indeed the *Scotch* Nation had a Right to this piece of Partiality from their noble Countryman, in compenſation for all the Injury which his Ambition has done them. They had a juſt Claim to the Affection of their Fellow-ſubjects in the South, having behaved like *Engliſhmen*, in the Courſe of this War; and their Behaviour would have compleated the Union, and have extinguiſhed all difference between *Engliſh* and *Scotch*, had not his Ambition unſeaſonably interpoſed, and excited Jealouſies, which have put back the Union for Twenty Years at leaſt.

Theſe were the principal of the late Miniſter's Meaſures, which were oppoſed in Parliament; and that the Oppoſition was

not

not factious, appears from one Circumſtance, which deſerves to be mentioned to the Honour of the Oppoſers. Their Diſlike of the whole of his Adminiſtration, of the Foundation and the Conduct of it, did not influence them to oppoſe the neceſſary Buſineſs of Government, as has been the practice of former Oppoſitions. They were too well affected to his Majeſty to do this; and though it may be ſaid, that their ſmall Number would have rendered it ineffectual, yet that Conſideration did not weigh with them, when, impelled by the beſt Principles, they oppoſed the extravagant Panegyric upon a Peace, which they could not approve, and the oppreſſive Tax upon Cyder. They oppoſed, when they ſaw juſt ground for Oppoſition; and concurred in Meaſures, which as Friends to their King and Country, they could not oppoſe.

Indeed the Weight and Dignity of their Oppoſition amply ſupplied the defect of Numbers. Had they been merely a Body

of

of factious, ignorant, precipitate, turbulent Men, they would have found it difficult to have made an Impreſſion, or to provoke the lamentable Complaints, which this Pamphlet makes of their Oppoſition. But when Men of gravity, of long experience in Buſineſs, and of unblemiſhed Characters, are concerned in Oppoſition, their want of Numbers only retards their Succeſs, for their Characters finally ſecure it.

They have carried a great Point for their Country already, in rendering the late obnoxious Miniſter weary of a publick Profeſſion of his Power, for which this Advocate of his confeſſes him unqualified. They have not had time, to take any Step againſt his Succeſſors or Subſtitutes; (it is uncertain hitherto which to call them;) yet the bare Union of ſuch Men, it ſeems, is alarming, and provokes a Pamphlet againſt them, even at the time, when they are retiring into the Country, and when it is not perfectly clear, what Meaſure, or

what

what Men they will have to oppoſe the next Winter. It is, and has been long before they were in oppoſition, perfectly clear, that they wiſh well to their Country. If that alone be alarming, we have no Encouragement to entertain a very favourable Idea of the Perſons ſo intimidated.

The Leaders of the Oppoſition are charged with exerciſing their own lawleſs Will, with boldly trampling upon the Laws of the Land, with caſting inflammatory Hand-Bills into every Houſe. The Reader will judge for himſelf, what Credit to give to this, when he conſiders, who are the ſuppoſed Leaders of the Oppoſition, and who is the Perſon, that charges them thus? It is a Writer, who affirms, That the Cyder Bill paſſed the Houſe of Commons *without a Diviſion*. Such a Writer complains with a very ill grace of Licentiouſneſs, and is, conſidering the Rank and Character of the Leaders of Oppoſition, as licentious in thus traducing

traducing them, as any Man who *falſely* traduces the Perſons in Adminiſtration.

He begins his Pamphlet with a flowery Account of the Means, by which Ambition works its way to Greatneſs. I could flouriſh upon the ſame Subject, and ſmile at the littleneſs of Ambition, in giving a Hiſtory of the Riſe and Progreſs of ſome Men to Greatneſs; but I am content, that theſe general Obſervations ſhould remain where they are, in his Pamphlet, and am not afraid to truſt the Publick with the Application of them. Perſonal Reproach becomes very needleſs, when the proper Objects of it are placed by Fortune or by themſelves, in a conſpicuous View.

The Oppoſers of the late Miniſter ſeem not in the Opinion of this Writer, to be naturally proper Objects of general Diſlike, for he drags in perſonal Abuſe, againſt even their ſuppoſed Friends, with a Violence which grows quite impertinent to the Reader.

He has Recourſe even to Mad-houſes for it, and imputes the miſcarriage of a Scheme for ſuppreſſing them, to a Gentleman, whoſe Conduct in that and every Thing elſe he would have applauded, had he accepted the Office, to which he was preſſingly invited. His Character is loaded with a parcel of opprobrious Epithets, which require no other Anſwer than this, that had he been more complying, inſtead of thoſe Epithets, this very Writer would probably have deſcribed him, as an able, lively, eloquent, dextrous, penetrating, indefatigable, univerſal Genius.

But Praiſe and Cenſure are ſo ſtrangely diſtributed by the Author of *the Conſiderations*, that a good Subject would wiſh his Majeſty's Name had been left out of the Piece. No one can ſay any Thing in praiſe of the King, to which the Oppoſers of his late Miniſter are not ready to ſubſcribe. But as he is too magnanimous, to lend his Name for a Shield to other Men's Characters and

Meaſures,

Meaſures, ſo the Servants of his Royal Grandfather bear too much Reſpect to their preſent Sovereign, to be deterred from their Duty to their Country, by the Proſtitution, which ſome Men venture to make of his amiable Name. They never have countenanced any Thing, that is meant as an Indignity to him, and they never will.

They deſpiſe the Charge of intending to force themſelves into Power. They were indeed forced out; but how did they conduct themſelves? Not as FACTIOUS Men. They were not even formed into any Thing like an Aſſociation, till long after they had ſeen both public and private Reaſons to be diſguſted. When the firſt Step towards the abſolute Power of the late Miniſter was taken, by diſmiſſing, without the leaſt Reaſon aſſigned, a moſt able and faithful Servant of the Crown; did the Friends of that Gentleman make a common Cauſe of it? So far from this, his Enemy exulted in ſeeing the Meaſure take Place without Op-

 poſition;

poſition; and imputed the Silence of thoſe Friends to their Indifference about the Event; whereas the reſt of their Conduct argues it to have proceeded from an Unwillingneſs to embarraſs their Sovereign, by quitting his Service.

When the Miniſter, who has placed *Great-Britain* at the Head of *Europe*, found it neceſſary to retire, did all thoſe, who regretted that Neceſſity, follow him? Moſt of his Friends and Admirers in the Adminiſtration thought it their Duty to the King, to acquieſce in an Event, which could not be agreeable to them, and was too true a Prelude of their own Fate. When two noble Dukes, who had acquired by their Characters more real Friends, than their Supplanter could purchaſe with the Favours of the Crown, were effectually ſupplanted, did they form any League againſt Government? They had too much to loſe, not to wiſh well to Government in general, and were too zealouſly attached to the Family on the Throne,

Throne, to Sacrifice their Duty to any other Conſideration.

But when all theſe great Men ſaw a Miniſter eſtabliſhing himſelf in a Manner, which had an unconſtitutional Tendency, and with the Aſſiſtance of Men, whom they would have been afraid to truſt with any ſhare in the Conduct of public Meaſures, it was time to depart from the Exceſs of their Moderation, though they never plunged into the Exceſſes of Oppoſition.

The People immediately ſided with them, and the FIRM Miniſter gave Way. What have they done ſince, to provoke the libellous Language of the *Conſiderations?* It ſeems they have DINED together. To what a Condition would this Writer reduce the Liberties of his Country, who makes EATING an Overt-act of Conſpiracy againſt the State? and how very diffident muſt the Miniſters be of their own Credit and Strength, who are alarmed, becauſe a Set of Men,

diſarmed of all Power, but that which ariſes from Superiority of Character, are united together in a friendly Intercourſe.

But the Truth is, as they are the *worthieſt*, ſo they are the *ableſt* Servants the Crown can have. When the late Miniſter ſupplanted them, he foreſaw not the difficulty of conducting the State without them; without their *Abilities* and their *Credit*; and he repented too late of his Precipitation. His Advocates have vainly boaſted of his Fortitude in ſeizing the Helm, when other Men abandoned the Veſſel; whereas it is well known to have been his original Intention to board the Veſſel, and throw ſome, whilſt he was obliging others to throw themſelves, overboard. They were all unwilling to quit it, till he compelled them; and at laſt, finding how much he had miſtaken his own Strength, he jumped overboard himſelf, and left his Royal Maſter, to whom he was more obliged, than ever any Subject was, to the mercy of Wind and Waves.

The

The Oppoſers are too ſenſible of the State, to which our excellent King is reduduced, by the Conduct of that Miniſter, ever wilfully to aggravate it by theirs. The Writer delivers it as his Opinion, that they ought never to be admitted to any Department in Adminſtration. He might have ſpared that Opinion. They are as much above the ambitious Views of ſome Men, as they are above obeying the Commands of any Fellow-ſubject whatever.

It is no wonder, that a Writer, who urges a Precedent of Severity from the Reign of *James the Second*, ſhould be out of Humour with Party Diſtinctions. If that be a Reign of Authority with him, he may well be diſguſted at the Exiſtence of a WHIG. Party Diſtinctious, which have no other Object, than to raiſe or inflame public Diſturbances, are odious at all Times, whatever the Names of the Parties may be. But the Name of a WHIG has Objects ſo

much more honourable and worthy of a *Britiſh* Subject, that there is not perhaps a Man in the united Kingdom, who bears that Name, and is aſhamed of it; and the moſt ſuſpicious Evidence an Adminiſtration can give of evil Deſigns, is that of treating a Name with Contempt, to which a Signification, ſo important to Liberty, has been annexed for near a Century paſt.

If any eminent WHIGS have been too conſcious of their Rank and their Services, and too much influenced by their Party Principles, to take the Oaths to the Earl of *Bute*, inſtead of the King, what Offence have they given to that noble Lord's Succeſſors, unleſs it be an Aggravation of their Guilt, that they are as little diſpoſed to take the Oaths to them?

Our Author preſcribes to his Majeſty the Expedient of diſcountenancing both Parties, and intruſting the Poſts of Government to *Neuters*. If he is in earneſt, I beg leave to object

object to his Advice, that there is not a *ſenſible* Man, who has not conceived an Opinion upon the great Points, which diſtinguiſh Parties in this Kingdom, and there is not an *honeſt* Man, who will diſſemble his Opinion. Who then are the *Neuters* our Author recommends? They muſt be Perſons of too weak, or too unſtable a Judgment, to form a fixed Opinion, or Perſons ſo little under the influence of their Opinion, as to be ready to co-operate with *any* Party, for *any* Purpoſe, as beſt ſuits their immediate private Intereſt. We have experienced, that there are ſuch Men, and I need not point them out to the Author of the *Conſiderations*. I can truly aſſure him, that they are not to be found among the Perſons, who have appeared in Oppoſition to the late Miniſter.

THEY will be a very inoffenſive Body of Men, if it ſhould be their good Fortune to ſee *Whig* meaſures purſued, with *unaffected* Wiſdom, with *real* and *judicious* Oeconomy,

and

and with *manly* Firmneſs. If any Miniſters, deſtitute of theſe Qualities, ſhould feel a Weakneſs ariſing from a want of the Support and Concurrence, which other Men are not obliged to give them, let them impute their Fall to its real Cauſe, the Diſproportion between their Undertaking and their Strength.

The Writer complains, that Men of Honour, Spirit and Ability, enter into the Service of Government with Reluctance. He imputes it to the Rage of Party; but unguardedly hints at a more obvious Cauſe, in the next Sentence, where he confeſſes, that Offices at preſent are held upon *uneaſy precarious* Terms. This was not the Caſe heretofore, and cannot be the Caſe, under an Adminiſtration approved both by the King and People.

Every Friend to his Country, however unconnected with Miniſters or with Oppoſitions, muſt wiſh for ſuch an Adminiſtration;

tion ; and whenever it takes Place, there can be no doubt of the Return of his Majeſty's Popularity, of which, this Writer indirectly confeſſes, his Miniſter has deprived him. It might be preſuming too far upon the Credulity of the Public, to intimate, that none but virtuous Men will be employed under ſuch an Adminiſtration; after a Promiſe of that kind ſo lately made, and ſo lately violated. But, if ever a change to the Satisfaction of both King and People ſhould take place, it may be ſafely promiſed, without Authority, that, as the Maſk of Virtue has been lately worn down to Tranſparency, Virtue will not appear in the Shape of a Maſk under a wiſe Adminiſtration.

In the mean Time, I agree with the Author, that it is ſeriouſly to be wiſhed, the public Peace may be preſerved. It is in the Power of all Men to contribute to this, but of none more, than Perſons in eminent Offices in the State. If they can reſtore to the Minds of the People a Confidence in

Govern-

Government, they will have nothing to fear from Faction, and need not be at the Pains, nor incur the Diſgrace, of *falſely* imputing factious Deſigns to the greateſt and beſt Men of the Age.

It would be impertinent to explain to them, how this Confidence may be obtained. They doubtleſs know perfectly well, that it cannot take place, till the public has received Evidences of their ABILITY and DISINTERESTEDNESS. Hitherto Appearances are not calculated to give them the Reputation of either. Some late Proceedings impreſs no very high Idea of their *Ability*; and certain *Penſions* and *reverſionary Patents*, which have been talked of, in this dawn of their Adminiſtration, and have not been abſolutely denied, render their *Diſintereſtedneſs* very doubtful.

Having thus admitted, that the public Peace ought, if poſſible, to be preſerved, I may juſtly claim from our Author a fair Con-

Conceſſion in return; that the Perſons in Oppoſition have as equitable a Right to ingenuous and candid Treatment, as the Perſons in Adminiſtration. It is infamous, though perhaps not penal, to impute to them Tranſactions, in which they are known to be unconcerned; and it is a very different Offence, in the Eye of Morality, from that, which may ſometimes be pronounced penal, of delivering out bold and intereſting Truths, relating to a Fellow-ſubject in Power.

F I N I S.

1974
D763
W2190